



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/552,410

10/07/2005

Takehito Nakayama

1217-052834

2397

28289

7590

06/30/2009

THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C.  
700 KOPPERS BUILDING  
436 SEVENTH AVENUE  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219

EXAMINER

MCCLELLAND, KIMBERLY KEIL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1791

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/30/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/552,410

**Applicant(s)**

NAKAYAMA, TAKEHITO

**Examiner**

KIMBERLY K. MCCLELLAND

**Art Unit**

1791

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05/04/09.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-11, 22 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-7, 12, 14-21, and 27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-11 and 22-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 May 2009 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The amendment filed 05/04/09 to the specification is acceptable and has been entered. Consequently, the previous objection to the specification is withdrawn.

### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings were received on 05/04/09. These drawings are acceptable and have been entered. Consequently, the previous objection to the drawings is withdrawn.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 8-10, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,328,546 to Brady et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0133762 to Yamamoto et al.
5. With respect to claim 8, Brady et al. discloses a photo resist film application mechanism, including a mounting table (74) having an wafer-mounting surface on which the wafer (72) is mounted; a movable fixing roll (46) for attaching and fixing a long support film to the member, the support film (40) having a sticky and removable surface to which the pre-cut protective tape is attached; the apparatus being constructed such

that: the support film (40) is arranged above the mounting table (74) so that the pre-cut protective tape is included in the frame member; the fixing roll (46) moves to fix the support film to the member; and the support film (40) is released from the pre-cut protective tape (column 5, lines 3-44; See Figure 5). However, Brady et al. does not specifically disclose a frame member surrounding the wafer-mounting surface of the mounting table, the fixing roll having a width greater than the interior width of said frame member such that said fixing roll does not fit within the interior perimeter of said frame member, a movable sticking roll for sticking the pre-cut protective pre-cut protective tape to the wafer with a mechanism for moving the sticking roll to press the support film and the pre-cut protective tape carried by the frame member to stick the pre-cut protective tape to the wafer, the sticking roll having a width less than the interior width of said frame member such that said sticking roll fits within the interior perimeter of said frame member.

6. Yamamoto et al. discloses a wafer transport apparatus, including a frame member (f) surrounding the wafer-mounting surface of the mounting table, the frame member having an interior length and an interior width defining an interior perimeter surrounding the wafer (See Figures 1, 7-9, and 14-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the frame member of Yamamoto et al. with the mounting table disclosed by Brady et al. The motivation would have been to effectively hold and contain the wafer during the laminating and fixing process. Yamamoto et al. also discloses the fixing roll (22) moves across the frame member having a width greater than the interior width of said frame

member (f) such that said fixing roll does not fit within the interior perimeter of said frame member moved across the frame member (See Figures 7-9) and a movable sticking roll (28) movable within the interior perimeter of the frame member for sticking the pre-cut protective pre-cut protective tape to the wafer, the sticking roll having a width less than the interior width of said frame member such that said sticking roll fits within the interior perimeter of said frame member (See Figures 14-15). While not explicitly stated in the description, it is inherent the roller (22) of Yamamoto et al. is wider than frame (f) in order to press the adhesive film onto the entire perimeter of the frame. While not explicitly stated in the description, it is inherent the roller (28) of Yamamoto et al. is narrower than frame (f) in order to press the adhesive film onto the wafer recessed within the inner perimeter of the frame (f; See Figures 14-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the dimensions of the fixing and sticking rollers as required by Yamamoto in the apparatus of Brady et al. The motivation would have been to effectively transport thin wafers while preventing warping (see paragraph 0002).

7. The phrases, "whereby the frame member relieves tension on said support film and the pre-cut protective tape", "the fixing roll moves to fix the support film to the frame member whereby the frame member relieves tension on said support film and the pre-cut tape; the sticking roll within moves to press the support film and the pre-cut protective tape carried by the frame member to stick the pre-cut protective tape to the semiconductor wafer", and "whereby the pre-cut protective tape is stuck to the wafer with reduced residual stress" are considered method steps, and are not found to be

Art Unit: 1791

positive recitations of any structural elements of the currently claimed apparatus. The examiner would like to note that while features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. In *re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997); "[A]pparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does." *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc.*, 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (emphasis in original). A claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987). See MPEP § 2114. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the claimed use then it meets the claim. *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235, 238 (CCPA 1967); *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 459 (CCPA 1963). Also, a "whereby" statement does not define the structure of an apparatus. *In re Mason*, 114 USPQ 127. Consequently, the apparatus of the above combination meets applicant's currently claimed invention.

8. As to claim 9, Brady et al. discloses a wind-up roll (42) for the support film (40) aid wind-up roll defining a wind-up direction as a direction the support film moves after the pre-cut protective tape is stuck to the wafer; and a fixed end (41) of the support film located at a feed-out roll; the apparatus being constructed such that: when the fixing roll (46) is moved toward the member while pressing the support film (40) moves between the wind-up roll (42) and the fixed end (41), the pre-cut protective tape attached to the

Art Unit: 1791

support film (40) between the wind-up roll (42) and the fixing roll (42) in a direction opposite to the wind-up direction such that the pre-cut protective tape is positioned in the frame of the member (See Figure 5); and the support film (40) is wound on the wind-up roll (42). However, Brady et al. does not specifically disclose a frame member or the fixing roll is presses the support film to fix the support film to the frame member; the sticking roll is presses the support film in the frame of the frame member to stick the pre-cut protective tape to the wafer; and the fixing roll moves away from the frame member.

9. Yamamoto et al. discloses a wafer transport apparatus, including a frame member (f) surrounding the wafer-mounting surface of the mounting table (See Figures 1, 7-9, and 14-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the frame member of Yamamoto et al. with the mounting table disclosed by Brady et al. The motivation would have been to effectively hold and contain the wafer during the laminating and fixing process.

10. The phrase, "the fixing roll moves away from the frame member and simultaneously the support film is released from the pre-cut protective tape" is considered a method step, and is not found to be a positive recitation of any structural elements of the currently claimed apparatus. The examiner would like to note that while features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. In re Schreiber, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997); "[A]pparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device

does.” *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc.*, 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (emphasis in original). A claim containing a “recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus” if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987). See MPEP § 2114.

11. As to claim 10, Brady et al. discloses clamping the support film across a width, the apparatus being constructed such that: the support film (40) is clamped at longer edge portions thereof with the clamping member (84) and the pre-cut protective tape is arranged such that the pre-cut protective tape is positioned in the member (86; column 6, lines 3-10; See Figure 6). However, Brady et al. does not specifically disclose a frame member or the sticking roll is caused to press the support film in the frame of the frame member to stick the pre-cut protective tape to the wafer.

12. Yamamoto et al. discloses a wafer transport apparatus, including a frame member (f) surrounding the wafer-mounting surface of the mounting table (See Figures 1, 7-9, and 14-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the frame member of Yamamoto et al. with the mounting table disclosed by Brady et al. The motivation would have been to effectively hold and contain the wafer during the laminating and fixing process.

13. The phrase, “whereby, when the fixing roll presses the support film to fix the support film to the frame member, and the sticking roll presses the support film fixed to the frame member to stick the pre-cut protective tape to the wafer, the support film is



released from the pre-cut protective tape by relative movement of the clamping member.” is considered a method step, and is not found to be a positive recitation of any structural elements of the currently claimed apparatus. The examiner would like to note that while features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. In *re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997); “[A]pparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does.” *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc.*, 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (emphasis in original). A claim containing a “recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus” if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987). See MPEP § 2114. Also, a “whereby” statement does not define the structure of an apparatus. *In re Mason*, 114 USPQ 127.

14. Claims 11 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,328,546 to Brady et al. in view U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0133762 to Yamamoto et al. as applied to claims 8-10, above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,080,263 to Saito et al.

15. With respect to claims 11 and 22-23, Brady et al. discloses a photo resist film application mechanism, including accurately positioning the film over the semiconductor

wafer by controlling the transport web (column 2, lines 34-56). However, Brady et al. does not specifically disclose aligning means for relatively moving the frame member to which the support film is attached and the mounting table on which the wafer is mounted to permit alignment of the pre-cut protective tape in the frame of the frame member with the wafer.

16. Saito et al. discloses an apparatus for applying protective film to a semiconductor wafer, including aligning means for relatively moving the frame member to which the support film is attached and the mounting table on which the wafer is mounted to permit alignment of the pre-cut protective tape in the frame of the frame member with the wafer (See Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the arts at the time the invention was made to combine the aligning means taught by Saito et al. with the mounting table disclosed by Brady et al. The motivation would have been to accurately place the protective film during the lamination steps and ensure effective coverage of the wafer.

### ***Response to Arguments***

17. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8-11 and 22-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The newly amended claim language necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Applicant's remaining pertinent arguments are addressed below:

18. Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view

of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

19. With respect to applicant's arguments regarding the semiconductor wafer and the circuits, examiner notes these features are considered the contents of the apparatus (i.e. an apparatus for sticking tape). Neither the semiconductor nor the circuits are positively recited as part of the current apparatus. Examiner notes expressions relating the apparatus to contents thereof during an intended operation are of no significance in determining patentability of the apparatus claim. *Ex parte Thibault*, 164 USPQ 666,667 (Bd. App. 1969).

20. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, see paragraph 9 of the previous office action. As stated therein, "The motivation would have been to effectively hold the adherend during the lamination and fixing process". Applicant has not addressed this motivation supplied by the examiner in the final office action dated 12/03/08. Consequently, this argument is not persuasive and the rejection is maintained.

21. In response to applicant's argument that Brady does not disclose preventing warpage, the fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

22. With respect to applicant's argument that the combination of the frame and roller of Yamamoto with the device of Brady would result in an apparatus unsuitable for its

intended purpose, examiner disagrees. The frame and roller of Yamamoto would not interfere with the placement and attachment of the device of Brady, as Yamamoto is drawn to the same field of attaching tapes to wafers. As such, the frame and roller would not interfere with the design of Brady, because it is intended to perform the same function. Consequently, this argument is not persuasive.

23. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

24. Applicant's remaining arguments are based on the dependency of claims 9-11 and 22-23 on independent claim 8. These arguments are not persuasive for the reasons stated above.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIMBERLY K. MCCLELLAND whose telephone number is (571)272-2372. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 a.m.-5 p.m. Mon-Thr.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Philip C. Tucker can be reached on (571)272-1095. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1791

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/K. K. M./  
Examiner, Art Unit 1791

KKM

/Philip C Tucker/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791